Vol. X., No. 10. JANUARY, 1921.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

A Magazine to maintain the cause of
TRUTH, FREEDOM, and COMPREHENSIVENESS
in the Church of England.

EDITOR: REV. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE
Signs of the Times :	
Bishops and Biblical Studies	503
Liberal Catholicism and the Creeds	504
The Creed of the Re-united Church	506
Evangelical Attacks on Modernism	508
The Passing of the Miraculous	509
The Poverty of the Clergy	511
The Quality of Ordinands	512
The Magna Carta of the Laity .. .. .. The Editor.	515
Re-union and the Lambeth Proposals .. .. Hastings Rashdall, D.Litt., F.B.A.	518
The Doubt of Robertson of Brighton	525
Christian Science in Theory and Fact	531
Natural Law and Miracle .. .. .. J. C. Hardwick, M.A.	536
In Troublous Times .. .. Sir William Ashley, Ph.D.	540
Review: A New Philosophy	547
Correspondence	549

OXFORD: BASIL BLACKWELL, 49 BROAD STREET

Price 1/- net. Annual Subscription, 7/6.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

All literary contributions and books for review should be addressed to:—The Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D., Ripon Hall, Oxford.

All advertisements and orders should be addressed to:—BASIL BLACKWELL, Office of *The Modern Churchman*, 49 Broad Street, Oxford.

THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION

FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF LIBERAL RELIGIOUS THOUGHT

Inaugurated at the Church House, Westminster, October 31st, 1898.

President—Professor PERCY GARDNER, Litt.D., F.S.A., F.B.A., Oxford.

Vice-Presidents:

PHILIP H. BAGENAL, O.B.E.
F. C. CHANNING, Esq.
The ARCHDEACON OF WESTMINSTER, F.B.A.
The Rev. Canon CREMER.
The DEAN OF CARLISLE, F.B.A.
The Rev. HUBERT HANDLEY.
The Rev. GEORGE HENSLOW.
Sir LAURENCE JONES, Bt.
The Rev. Prof. KIRSOPP LAKE.
The Rev. W. MANNING.
The Rev. Dr. MORRISON.
The Rev. Canon PAPILLON.
The DEAN OF PETERBOROUGH.
The Rev. Canon PLUMPTRE.
J. ST. LOE STRACHEY, Esq.
The Rev. Dr. SYMONDS.

Members of the Council:

Chairman: Canon GLAZEBROOK, D.D.

Hon. G. COLERIDGE, Rev. A. FAWKES, M.A., Rev. JOHN GAMBLE, B.D., Rev. W. LUMMIS, B.D., Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D., C. NORWOOD, D.Litt., Canon PAPILLON, M.A., Mrs. REITH, Mr. H. F. WALKER, Miss E. M. ALLEN, Right Rev. Bishop HAMILTON BAYNES, Mr. W. B. GORDON, Rev. H. HANDLEY, M.A., The Very Rev. W. R. INGE, C.V.O., D.D., Prof. F. B. JEVONS, D.Litt., Rev. C. H. S. MATTHEWS, M.A., Sir HARRY REICHEL, LL.D., Rev. C. F. RUSSELL, M.A., The DEAN OF CARLISLE, Canon TOLLINTON, D.D., Rev. H. A. WILSON, M.A., Rev. C. SHARP, M.A., Rev. Dr. MORRISON, Miss A. GARDNER, Rev. J. R. COHU, M.A., Rev. W. CUNNINGHAM CRAIG, M.A., Rev. C. W. EMMET, B.D., The MASTER OF JESUS COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, Rev. W. M. PRYKE, B.D., Rev. F. G. GIVEN-WILSON. Hon. Mrs. MATHESON, Rev. A. J. CARLYLE, D.Litt., Rev. C. BASS, M.A., Canon G. RENDALL, D.Litt., Prebendary CALDECOTT, D.Litt., Rev. J. R. COHU, Mrs. MICHELMORE.

Hon. Secretary and Treasurer—P. BAGENAL, O.B.E., 32 George Street, Hanover Square, W.1.
Hon. Auditor—Mr. ROBERT WARNER, F.C.A., 221 Moorgate Station Chambers, E.C.2.
Hon. Organizing Secretary—Miss D. NUSSEY, Westfield, Ilkley.
Assistant Hon. Secretary—Miss DOWELL.
Hon. Librarian—Rev. W. M. PRYKE, Bradninch Vicarage, Collumpton, Devon.
Bankers—LONDON CITY AND MIDLAND BANK, 129 New Bond Street, W.1.

AIMS OF THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION.

1.—To affirm the continuous and progressive character of the revelation given by the Holy Spirit in the spheres of knowledge and of conduct.
2.—To maintain the right and duty of the Church of England to restate her doctrines from time to time in accordance with this revelation.
3.—To uphold the historic comprehensiveness of the Church of England.
4.—To defend the freedom of responsible students, clerical as well as lay, in their work of criticism and research.
5.—To promote the adaptation of the Church services to the needs and knowledge of the time.
6.—To assert the claim of the laity to a larger share in the government and responsible work of the Church.
7.—To foster co-operation and fellowship between the Church of England and other Christian Churches.
8.—To study the application of Christian principles and ideals to the whole of our social life.

Annual Subscription.—Members at least 7/6; Associates, 1/-; Life Membership, £10. Cheques should be made payable to the Hon. Secretary of the Churchmen's Union.

All communications as to membership, subscriptions, changes of address, and business matters should be sent to the Hon. Secretary, Churchmen's Union, 10 Clifford Street, Bond Street, W.1.

The Modern Churchman is sent **free** to all full members of the Churchmen's Union.

THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 10. JANUARY, 1921. Vol. X.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Bishops and Biblical Studies

There will be general satisfaction on the part of Liberal Churchmen that Dr. William Temple has been designated Bishop of Manchester. His ability, energy, eloquence and enterprise make the appointment a promising one. Dr. Temple will be no unworthy successor of Bishops Fraser and Moorhouse whether as an organiser or a preacher, but we could wish that he were somewhat more of a Biblical student.

The Guardian (Dec. 24) publishes an eloquent sermon delivered by the Bishop-designate to ordinands at St. Paul's Cathedral on the Fourth Sunday in Advent. It opens with an account of the factors in the call of Isaiah. The passage runs thus:

> 'So it had been with Isaiah. He knew of the humiliation of the king who had let his pride carry him to sacrilege. Uzziah, the prosperous and glorious monarch, had attempted to usurp the right to offer sacrifice in the Temple. The priests resisted him, and as his face flushed with anger in the controversy, the white leprosy stood out on his forehead. He hastened away to live until he should die in the dreadful seclusion which was the doom of lepers.'

Biblical exegesis which makes Isaiah in the eighth century B.C. acquainted with the fourth century *Midrash* of the Book of Chronicles, and suggests that Uzziah's leprosy was caused by his invasion of priestly functions would, we fear, make the late Dr. Driver turn in his grave. If it was not sacrilegious

for David and Solomon to offer sacrifice, it could hardly be sacrilege for their royal descendant, Uzziah, to burn incense in the Temple, although the Book of Kings does not attribute any such desire to him. Moreover, to suggest that Uzziah was smitten with leprosy as a punishment for sacrilege, although doubtless in harmony with the hierarchical tendency of post-exilic Judaism and its priestly chronicler, does not commend itself to the modern Biblical student as either sound history or sound theology.

The English bishop at his consecration vows to instruct the people out of the Holy Scriptures and to exercise himself in the Holy Scriptures. This means to-day serious Biblical study for bishops. We deplore a falling standard of Biblical knowledge in our ordinands, but it requires no very critical eye to detect it also in our bishops. It is for that reason that we have selected the youngest of our Fathers-in-God, that we may the more respectfully direct their attention to this episcopal obligation.

> THE ARCHBISHOP: Will you then faithfully exercise yourself in the same holy Scriptures, and call upon God by prayer, for the true understanding of the same; so as you may be able by them to teach and exhort with wholesome Doctrine . . . ?
> ANSWER: I will so do, by the help of God.

When Stubbs, of Oxford, said to a girls' school: 'There is one book, its title begins with B, which all we bishops must study,' and the school replied, 'The Bible,' the Bishop's retort, 'Bradshaw,' went to the heart of the matter. There is too much public speaking to allow much time for private study.

Liberal Catholicism and the Creeds

In a sermon at St. Martin's-in-the-Fields by the Rev. N. E. Egerton Swann, Chairman of the Liberal Catholic League, preached recently on behalf of that body, the preacher dealt with the pressing and difficult question of the test of Churchmanship. He said:

> 'The fact is that the Church must think out entirely afresh where lies the true centre of her religion, and what is the sound test of legitimate membership. She may find them in the outlook and spirit of the Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels; or she may find them in a Creed, in a particular hierarchical organisation, in a certain type of devotional observance. But she cannot find them in *both* these at

once. If the first is the thing that matters, then doctrinal formularies and Church institutions must be quite secondary in importance. They may still be of very high value, but they are so, only in so far as they help to produce or maintain the outlook and spirit of Jesus. And it is a very plain matter of experience that the severest orthodoxy very often goes with a singular lack of these, while a very high measure of this 'mind of Christ' is often found in the most unorthodox and most anti-ecclesiastical. For this reason we must simply make our choice between the two standards: it has got to be the one or the other. If the heart and essence of Christianity are the outlook and spirit of Jesus, then we must recognize as really of us, all who show that they possess these; and as *not* really of us, all who fail to do so, however heartily they may repeat formularies or conform to our externals

Here we have the issue clearly stated that those who would secure a re-united Church have got to face. So far they have not really faced it, but have retired behind the fortifications of the Nicene Creed. Admirable as the Nicene Creed was in the fourth century, it will hardly satisfy the present need, because we have got to advance from it, rather than retire behind it. Are we then to do without a Creed? Mr. Egerton Swann regards this as an impossible suggestion.

'Obviously, if the Church is to exist at all, she must stand for *some* definite convictions. And these, once they are stated, are a creed.'

What Mr. Egerton Swann stands for is not a new creed, but the Church's power to revise or re-write its creed, and the large freedom which should be allowed the individual Churchman in interpreting particular doctrines in it. He states his case thus:

'It ought to be left entirely to the individual to adjust himself, as best he may, to particular doctrines. He ought not to be asked, do you believe this point? do you believe that? in what exact sense do you accept this third?

'I would say that this must apply, too, to candidates for Holy Orders. They indeed are undertaking special responsibilities, and will have to ask themselves questions that would not apply to applicants for baptism and confirmation. But it is for *them* to ask *themselves* such questions. The most that the Church is entitled to demand from them is a general assent to her Creeds, and it would be better to ask only for a *practical* undertaking to use her forms of worship.'

Certainly that the clergyman should possess some measure of Christ's spirit and Christ's outlook is the supreme qualification for Orders, but too many get the impression that what really matters is that 'he hath not spoken nor written anything against the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England.'

The Creed of the Re-united Church

The report of the preliminary meeting of the World Conference of Faith and Order, held at Geneva on August 12—20, has just been published.[1] It is a document of great interest, and makes a further step forward in the pilgrimage towards re-union. The importance of the Geneva Conference is attested by the fact that it was attended by delegates representing some forty nations and seventy autonomous Churches. The Church of Rome was the only large Christian communion which was unrepresented.

Members of the Conference, especially English-speaking Christians, welcomed the recent Lambeth Appeal as a great factor in the task of achieving Christian unity. It is impossible to sum up the trend of the discussions of the Conference in a few words, but we believe it to be correct to say that in considering the question of Church order it seemed to be generally recognized that unity must not be identified with uniformity: that valid orders are not the same as regular orders: that although apostolic succession has a historic value, it is not an essential of a valid ministry and of effective sacraments: that history and experience show the high value of the constitutional episcopate as a mode of Church government. These are brief conclusions, but what a volume of discussions and what a series of controversies have been needed to elucidate the point of view and the important synthesis which they express. It would really seem as though the exceedingly difficult problem of Church Order is now well on the road to a practical solution.

The Faith of the Re-united Church was the second subject of supreme importance to engage the attention of the Conference. Until this report came to hand, we were afraid that there was a tendency to avoid going deeply into this subject, and that the Conference would be disposed to adopt the tempting and otiose policy of accepting the Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds as the standard of faith. We congratulate the Conference on its courage in resolving to face this profound and diffi-

[1] Published by R. H. Gardiner, 174 Water Street, Gardiner, Maine, U.S.A.

cult question—profound, because it demands that we shall answer the question: What essentially is Christianity? Difficult, because the question is beset by the memory of many bitter controversies. If the Conference is resolved to answer this question, not with the well-worn dogmatic shibboleths of the traditional formularies, but in terms which are the outcome of the present teaching of the Divine Spirit of Truth, Freedom and Love, the Church of Christ will receive a vast increase of vital force, which can be directed into practical channels. For the right answer will abolish ancient and bitter controversies; it will eliminate wrong conceptions of what is fundamental in the Church's Faith; and it will assist right emphasis in presenting Christ's Gospel to mankind.

An army of phantoms vast and wan beleaguers the soul of the Christian teacher. They are the ghosts of ancient theological controversies, but they trouble the Christian Church even to-day. Arian and Sabellian, Nestorian and Pelagian, Docetist and Apollinarian, Adoptionist and Manichaean still leap to the lips of our clergy as terms by which to stigmatize the views of fellow-Christians with whom they differ in dogmatic matters. The laity know little of these things, but they are ever-present to the minds of the better educated clergy, whether English, Greek or Roman. If they speak on a doctrinal question, if they interpret an important passage of the New Testament, these ghosts of the past stand beside them and warn them how not to think and speak; hence these ghosts are a powerful influence in quelling spontaneity and freedom, courage and originality in Christian teaching.

Whilst our ancient creeds enshrine the fundamental convictions of the historic Christian Faith, it is their misfortune that they also harbour in their terms and phrases these controversial ghosts. It seems to us therefore that the World Conference would do well to get away from these controversial documents, the Catholic Creeds, and either write a new creed or else select a few great sentences from Christ's teaching as preserved in the New Testament to form the Creed of the Re-united Church. Inasmuch as all Christians acknowledge the moral and spiritual authority of Christ, if we took some words of His as our Creed, we should be far more likely to secure a Creed which would command the reverence and

adhesion of Christendom, than by attempting to obtain a Creed by any other conceivable means.

In order to secure a comprehensive Christian judgment in this matter, the Conference has issued four preliminary questions and has invited responsible gatherings of Church members of every denomination to discuss them. The questions are as follows:

1. What degree of unity in Faith will be necessary in a re-united Church?

2. Is a statement of this one Faith in the form of a Creed necessary or desirable?

3. If so, what Creed should be used? or what other formulary would be desirable?

4. What are the proper uses of a Creed and of a Confession of Faith.

The Conference especially requests that 'younger members' should be included in these discussions. The answers, which must be succinct, may be written in either English, French, German or Greek, and should be sent to the Bishop of Bombay, Malabar Hill, Bombay, India, before April 10th. We shall be glad, in order to give publicity to the views of Anglican Modernism in this important question, to publish answers from Liberal Churchmen in the *Modern Churchman*.

Evangelical Attacks on Modernism

Evangelical Christendom, the organ of the World's Evangelical Alliance, has in its last two numbers two paragraphs, headed 'Modernism in the Mission Field' and 'Modernism.' These contain quite unnecessary attacks on Modernism, and are the more injurious because they deliberately or ignorantly present Modernism in a false light.

The first paragraph opens thus:

> One of the sad facts of our mission work is the invasion of rationalist ideas among workers and converts. Owing to the circulation of literature this cannot be avoided. But it is absolutely necessary, if the Church of God is to be true to its mission, that those in responsible positions should be loyal to the Divine Revelation. We have observed with sadness that in some countries the fundamental truth of the Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ is not held by some of those who have gone there to preach the Gospel. It is noteworthy that these false views are generally put forward in lands where there is an old civilization and the educated classes are throwing off their traditional religious convictions and accepting the so-called results

of modern science. The native Christians who have adopted this position are believed by themselves to be in advance of their time. They are modernists *sans phrase,* and a temptation comes to the missionary to show that he is as much up-to-date as they are.

The second paragraph is on very much the same lines. It begins thus:

> We are suffering from a fresh invasion of 'modernism'—by which we mean not the spirit of accepting the facts of science and history which all Christians accept—but by the effort to maintain Christianity without belief in the root facts that have been revealed by God and narrated in Holy Scripture. We know the difficulties that arise from the miraculous in the minds of those who are obsessed by a mechanical view of the universe which has no place for God. The Christian recognizes the perplexity of those who have no room for God in the government of His world, but he cannot understand how a man who recognizes the Divine government of the world and the revelation of Jesus Christ as God and man, can with Holy Scripture in his hands, deny the facts of the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection.

To identify Modernism with a denial of 'the Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ' and His Resurrection may appeal to the less educated members of the World's Evangelical Alliance and win their confidence and support, but it is a grave misrepresentation of Modernism and is calculated to widen the gap between Evangelicals and Modernists which a more just and sympathetic attitude towards Modernism would do much to bridge. Christianity is not dependent for its influence today on a belief in past miracles, but upon the possession of the Spirit of Christ. If this be realized by Evangelicals and Modernists, there is no need why they should not work side by side both at home and abroad. We particularly regret this Evangelical attack on Modernism, because although an exclusive and intolerant Romanism must needs be hostile to Modernism, there is really no ground for conflict between Modernism and a spiritual Evangelicalism.

The Passing of the Miraculous

The January *Hibbert Journal* contains three articles by well-known members of the Churchmen's Union. Mr. Emmet examines the miracles of Sadhu Sundar Singh: Mr. G. G. Coulton demolishes the 'doctored' history and facile generalizations of Mr. Hilaire Belloc in a manner that must arouse the admiration of that whole-hearted believer in Papal Rome: Miss Dou-

gall deals faithfully and helpfully with some recent utterances of Canon Quick and Dr. Temple in reference to the miraculous.

She writes:

> 'The old, pre-Christian faith in a God who at times breaks in and does all that He wills, has grown with the higher faith, as tares grow up with wheat; but as tares and wheat grow together, the difference gradually becomes plain: the one will support life, the other will not' (p. 306).

We venture to think that it was not the Liberal theologians, but the war which killed belief in the miraculous. The poignant and persistent question: 'Why does not God stop the war?' compelled many Christian English men and women to conclude: 'Either there is no God at all or He does not care, or else if there be a God and He have the mind of Christ, He cannot and will not work miracles.' With that conclusion belief in the miraculous received its death-blow so far as the modern Christian world was concerned. The recent disappearance of Paley's *Miracles* as a prescribed text-book of Cambridge University symbolizes the disappearance of the miraculous from the world of modern religious thought. A few academic theologians may maintain it still, since a waning conception of what constitutes orthodoxy seems to them to demand it, but the post-war Christian has ceased to be interested in the subject. If he sees God at all, it is not through the chinks in His Universe. Though Canon Quick and Dr. Temple may plead that we could never believe that God sends us our daily bread by bakers, unless He sometimes sent it by ravens, the post-war generation feels that somehow this argument lacks cogency to-day, although apparently it convinced their Victorian grandmothers. The Quaker poet, Whittier, some fifty years ago, expressed the modern view in his verses:

> 'We ask no more, made lowly wise,
> For miracle and sign,
> Anoint our eyes to see within
> The common, the divine.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Henceforth my heart shall sigh no more
> For olden time and holier shore.
> God's love and blessing, then and there,
> Are now and here and everywhere.'

The Poverty of the Clergy

The Bishop of London wrote last month to the *Times* citing painful cases of clerical poverty, and soliciting money to relieve them. While we hope the Bishop got what he asked for, we deplore things being done in this way.

The Church of England has now got a large measure of self-government; it possesses a Central Church Fund; it commands a body of financial experts; it enjoys endowments so great that they are the envy of Colonial Churches; if, then, we are to continue to have a number of English clergymen on the brink of starvation, it will certainly be due to bad management, lack of foresight, and the proper adjustment of means to ends.

Practising Churchmen, who belong for the most part to the middle and upper classes, are now compelled, owing to crushing taxation, to turn a deaf ear to ecclesiastical appeals to respond on the pre-war scale. They have not got the money. Other classes must be brought under contribution. We are sure that the wage-earning classes are ready to support their clergy, when they like them, feel they are of real use, and that they really stand in need of financial assistance. But to secure this assistance means a special form of organization—possibly monthly house-to-house collections of promised subscriptions. But the situation seems to us to demand at least three other things.

(1) That the incumbent of every benefice shall publish annually a full account of his benefice. It is unreasonable to ask the laity to assist their clergyman financially unless they have accurate information on this point.

(2) That the Parochial Church Council shall decide before any clergyman (incumbent or curate) is appointed to work in the parish what his official income is to be, and what amount of it shall be raised by voluntary parochial contributions.

(3) That the Archdeacon, or in his stead the Rural Dean, shall be present to represent the diocese, when the Parochial Council is making these financial arrangements, and that all such financial arrangements must receive his approval in their final form. The incumbent and curates

ought not to be present at such discussions, nor ought the Parochial Council ever to discuss their incomes with them, but only with the Archdeacon or his deputy.

There are three other matters connected with clerical poverty that the laity must insist on :

(1) That no more clergy be ordained by the bishops than are needed, and that no more clergy be appointed to work in parishes than are needed for the proper working of the parish, and that unattended services be abolished.

(2) That the various unpaid lay ministries be greatly developed.

(3) That the schemes for pensions, dilapidations, and the uniting of small parishes be dealt with in a really energetic and business-like manner.

But whatever the Church does in the way of financial reform, we have to recognize that the permanent solution of the financial situation rests upon the quality of the clergy and the quality of their work. There were no cases of clerical poverty in More's *Utopia*.

The Quality of Ordinands

Sir Francis Younghusband, in a paper read at the Royal Colonial Institute on the maintenance of good relations between Great Britain and India, is reported in the *Times* of December 15th as saying :

> 'It was not on either political or commercial relations that a permanent, strong, and effective bond between India and England depended. The true tie must be the social tie. We want men who are fortunate enough to be gifted by nature with social talent, with a genius for friendship and for getting on with others—such men as Colonel Kelly, of the 23rd Sikh Pioneers, who, quite outside his purely military duties, would spend hours with his men, speaking to them in their own patois, discussing with them their village affairs and the prospects of their crops, telling them tales and listening to theirs. A company officer may be doing more towards attaching India to England than a Commander-in-Chief. Outside official duties, when Englishmen in India, soldiers or civilians, can join Indians in pursuits which both enjoy, whether it be polo, cricket, shooting, pig-sticking, or the enjoyment of the beauties of nature or of art, or in the search for truth, there is always the opportunity

for friendship to be formed. This process of social relationship is already in operation. What is not recognized is its importance. Already we have a glimmering of the importance of the social factor in the selection of Governors. We choose men of good social position for those posts. The qualifications of the wife are also considered. We put up with any kind of a wife in a Prime Minister. But in selecting a Viceroy we will often rule out a man on account of his wife.

'To strengthen the social tie between India and England we must qualify ourselves specially for it and train ourselves in social service. For such service it is gentlemen that are required. The secret of Lord Kitchener's power was that right down at the bottom he was a great gentleman, a genuine lover of his kind, with a high capacity for friendship. His success in winning the devotion of the late Ameer of Afghanistan was remarkable. The Royal Family, with their sensitiveness to the changes in national life, have been quick to change with the times. They are as "democratic" as any President of a Republic—perhaps more democratic than some Presidents. But being democratic need not mean losing the ideal of the gentleman.

'For the Government service itself there is also an urgent need for gentlemen from England. The astonishing thing is that the Government of India make no attempt to get them. They know perfectly well that the one essential qualification which Englishmen in their Military and Civil Service should possess is that they should be gentlemen. They know that the Indians themselves want and like to have them. What the Government of India has to do is first of all to make up their mind that it is gentlemen that they require, and then determine to treat gentlemen as gentlemen.'

When Sir Francis Younghusband is describing what India needs and likes in her English administrators, he is also describing what the English laity desire in their clergy, Some doubtless will contradict this. Mr. G. K. Chesterton once affirmed that the failure of the Church of England ministry was due to the number of gentlemen in it. Perhaps he was satirical. We are inclined to think that the influence of the English clergy, notwithstanding imperfect training and inadequate learning, has been largely due to many of them being gentlemen. While we should all find it hard to define a gentleman, we have no difficulty at all in recognizing him, and certainly we do not regard him as necessarily drawn from a particular class, but rather as always the possessor of certain moral and social qualities. It is the possession of these qualities which is essential to an influential ministry in an ordinary English parish. Are our Church authorities taking sufficient thought for this? Will the new form, which the Knutsford experiment has taken, assist it? There is no reason why it

should not, if the Knutsford authorities recognize, as no doubt they do, the importance of this qualification.

When Mr. George Herbert, of noble family and brilliant academic distinction, resolved to become a parson, his friends regarded him as having 'lost himself in a humble way.' As Dean Beeching points out in his admirable introduction to *The Country Parson:*

> 'The profession of a clergyman was not at this time looked upon as well fitted for a gentleman. Most of the great prelates of the time, Laud, Andrewes, Williams, Cosin, were sons of men beneath the degree of gentry.'

Herbert, when he entered the ministry, hoped to induce other men of good standing to follow his example, and his desire was laudable. We smile perhaps in these democratic days at the quaint phrases in which a contemporary of Herbert's commends the English ministry to Englishmen of birth and breeding, but we know, notwithstanding that there is truth in it:

> 'The Advantage of doing God Service, which Height of Birth gives to a Noble man or Gentleman, over what a Clerk of Lower Parentage hath, is very considerable. The truth taught by Them is sooner believed: A Reproof bestow'd by them is better received; An example of Virtue shew'd by Them makes deeper impression than the same coming from one of meaner extraction would do.'

What snobbery this seems! and yet if several dukes and a prince of the blood received Holy Orders to-day, and like Mr. George Herbert lost themselves in a humble way, it would set many less exalted men thinking that at least as great service could be rendered to the nation by such action as by entering the Army or Navy, or Diplomatic Service or the alluring world of politics. For as Mr. Herbert justly observed, and it is as true of our age as of his:

> 'I know we live in an Age that hath more need of good examples than precepts.'

THE MAGNA CARTA OF THE LAITY

By the Editor.

THE Parochial Church Councils Bill debated by the Church Assembly in November, and to be brought up for revision early in February, will, we believe, receive 'the general approval' of Liberal Churchmen as it has of the Church Assembly. It is certainly a much better measure than Lord Wolmer's Bill.

The clauses in the Parochial Church Councils Bill for the protection of the parochial laity from autocratic alteration of the parochial church services, and from the appointment to the parish of an unsuitable incumbent, deserve the serious attention of Churchmen who desire 'to assert the claim of the laity to a larger share in the government and responsible work of the Church.'

The clauses which deal with the relation of the parochial laity to parochial church services are 2, 6v. and 14. Clause 2 and clause 6, section v., are general: clause 14 is particular. They run as follows:

> 2.—It shall be the primary duty of the Parochial Church Council in every parish to co-operate with the Incumbent in the initiation, conduct and development of Church work both within the parish and outside.
>
> 6.—The Council of every parish shall have . . .
>
> (v) Power to make representations to the Bishop with regard to any matter affecting the welfare of the Church in the parish.
>
> 14.—Nothing in this Measure shall affect the rights, liabilities or duties of the Incumbent in respect of the church or the services or public worship therein or of the churchyard or any property belonging to the benefice, provided that the Incumbent shall from time to time consult with the Council concerning the services of the church and particularly concerning any important changes which he may propose to make in such services. And if, after such consultation, the Council shall be opposed to any such change, they shall have the right to make representations to the Bishop in respect thereof.

Some of the Assembly, notably Dr. Henson, desired to omit clause 2 as being too vague. It certainly is vague, but considering its purpose, it could not well be otherwise. It is a statement of primary duty, but it is really an appeal to the moral consciousness and goodwill of the Parochial Council. The success of the Council will depend on its keeping its

primary duty steadily in view, and it is well that this primary duty should be stated at the outset. The Council may easily get the notion that its primary duty is to restrain or curb or drive the incumbent. This clause asserts that its primary duty is to *co-operate* with him. In an earlier age this statement might have appeared in the preamble, but it matters little where it is stated, so that it be stated. We feel that there would be loss in the omission to state it.

Dr. Henson also wished to omit clause 14 on the ground that it was pretentious, misleading, ambiguous and futile. Unless Dr. Henson proposed at some later stage to introduce a clause or clauses dealing with the protection of the parochial laity from autocratic alteration of the parochial services; or held that the rights of the parochial laity are sufficiently protected in this matter by clause 6, section (v), it is hard to fathom the purpose of his motion. Again we feel unable to agree with his proposal, although we regard clause 14 as in need of re-casting.

Liberal Churchmen at least will agree that both the incumbent and the parishioners have rights and duties in the conduct of public worship, and that these rights and duties are clearly enough prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer. Where the incumbent proposes to depart from these prescriptions and from what has been the custom of the parish in the practical interpretation and observance of them, he ought to consult the Parochial Church Council and secure their support. If he cannot secure their support, he ought not to make the alteration. We venture, therefore, to suggest that clause 14 should be re-cast as follows:

> 14.—Should the Incumbent desire at any time to make any alteration in the times or mode of conducting public worship, he shall first consult the Parochial Church Council, and unless two-thirds of the Council vote in favour of the alteration, it shall not be made. Should the Incumbent presume to make any alteration without having first obtained the support of the Parochial Church Council in the manner prescribed in this Measure, the Council shall report the same to the Bishop.

If, however, the Assembly are not willing to re-cast clause 14, we would urge that it amend it by omitting the word 'important.' It is conceivable that a certain type of incumbent might bring about radical changes in the services of the parish church without the consent of the Council, by making the changes

piecemeal, and defend himself by claiming that no one of the changes made at any particular time was sufficiently 'important' to require him to consult the Parochial Church Council about it. A hundred black rabbits do not make one black horse.

We pass now to consider the provisions in the measure for protecting the parishioners from the appointment of an unsuitable incumbent. These are contained in clause 8, and run as follows:

> 8.—(1) Every Council shall have power to make representations to the patron of the benefice within 21 days of the voidance of such benefice with regard to the exercise of his power of presentation thereto, and the patron shall not exercise his power of presentation thereto until such a period has elapsed.
>
> (2) The notice required to be served on the churchwardens of a parish by Section 2 (2) of the Benefices Act, 1898, shall be served also on the Secretary of the Council, and within fourteen days from the service of any such notice the Council shall have power to petition the Bishop to refuse to collate, institute or admit any person proposed to be collated, instituted or admitted by him. Upon receiving any such petition the Bishop shall be entitled, after consulting a permanent Board of Assessors to be constituted for that purpose by the Diocesan Conference, to refuse to collate, institute or admit such person if he thinks fit, irrespective of any other power of refusal which he may possess by statute or otherwise.

This clause seems to us to deal with remarkable skill with an exceedingly difficult and delicate matter, and to succeed in protecting adequately the rights of the parishioners without seriously infringing the rights of patrons. We should wish, however, to see it expressly stated that this procedure includes benefices, of which the bishop himself is patron.

There is one important matter, so it seems to us, which is not provided for in this measure, and that is the publication annually of the accounts of the benefice. This ought to be done. Ignorance in this matter leads to much local misapprehension and misrepresentation. Clause 7, section (3), which provides for the laying of the accounts of all parochial ecclesiastical charities before the Parochial Church Council, might be the most suitable place for stating that these accounts are understood to include the accounts of the benefice.

The Parochial Church Councils Bill thus amended and legalized might well prove to be the Magna Carta of the parochial layman: but if it is to be his Magna Carta, he must take

his part in working it. If the great body of the parochial laity are going to stand aside and allow the machinery created by this measure to be grasped and controlled by a few ecclesiastical cranks and faddists, then the future state of the Church of England will be much worse than its present condition.

RE-UNION AND THE LAMBETH PROPOSALS

By the Very Rev. HASTINGS RASHDALL, D.Litt., D.D., F.B.A.,
Dean of Carlisle.

THE spirit of the resolutions and appeal put forth by the Lambeth Conference of 1920 seems to me not unworthy of the enthusiastic welcome which it has received. It is something to find that an Assembly of Bishops, which included many 'Catholics,' 'do not call in question for a moment the spiritual reality of the ministries of those Communions which do not possess the Episcopate,' and acknowledge that 'these ministries have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace.' This is very different from the tone which used to be common in the utterances of the High Anglican pulpit and press not many years ago, or even from the cautious and grudging admission of Professor Lock in *Lux Mundi*, that 'so far as they have banded themselves together into a society, they (Nonconformists) have something akin to the reality of the Church and gain some of its *social* [not religious or even moral] blessings,'[1] with the balancing clause that 'so far as such Christians are schismatic, they are untrue and harmful members of the Church.' (I suspect Prof. Lock would be a little ashamed of such a sentence now.) But when we come to the specific proposals of the Conference, I am unable to see that there has been any advance upon the attitude adopted by previous Conferences.

In particular there seems to me to run through the resolutions and the appended report of a Committee a certain confusion between three distinct things:

(1) *Re-union*, by which I mean the amalgamation of two or more existing Churches into one organized society.

[1] Ed. i. p. 383: italics mine.

(2) *Federation or Federal Union*, which means the continued existence of the separate Churches as autonomous societies, while they all recognize the authority of some Assembly or authority on which all are represented. The federation might be as close as that which now unites the various States of the American Republic, or as loose (practically if not in strict law) as that which unites the self-governing Dominions of the British Empire.

(3) *Mutual Recognition, i.e.* the continued existence of the various Churches as legally independent and autonomous societies, but each of them recognizing the others as true branches of the (ideally) one Church of Christ, their ministers as true ministers, their sacraments as 'valid' sacraments.

Now each of these things would be a good thing in itself, but they are not the same thing, and they are not equally good. For myself, I regard nothing less than actual re-union as the ideal to be aimed at. There might still of course be room for federation or some loose kind of alliance between independent national Churches (for here the evils attendant on formal or legal distinctness are much smaller, so far as they exist at all): but the ideal is to my mind that there should be only one organized Christian society in the same area. Nothing less than that would prevent the dissension, the friction, the competition, the overlapping and inefficiency which result from the present state of things. Because it is the ideal, it does not follow that it is ever to be completely realized: it is of the nature of ideals not to be fully realized on this earth. But that is what we ought to aim at; and the nearer we can approach it the better. Some form of federal union might do something in this direction, and mutual recognition—a fuller and more official recognition than now exists—would not be without its value. But the bishops do not seem to have made up their minds as to which of these things they are aiming at. When they talk about what is to happen, 'terms of union having been otherwise satisfactorily adjusted,' it might be supposed that they were contemplating actual or at least federal union; but when the bishops disclaim any attempt at 'reducing the different groups of Christians to uniformity (p. 12), and protest that 'they do not ask that any one Communion should be absorbed in another'

(p. 136), they do not seem to be thinking of re-union, but merely of some kind of mutual recognition. What is the difference between two or more 'Communions' and two or more 'Churches.' The bishops do not seem to recognize that if *per impossibile* they should succeed in persuading all the ministers of the existing Nonconforming bodies in England to receive episcopal ordination, while all of these communions went on being governed by their own respective authorities just as independently and autonomously as they are now, that would by itself do little or nothing to remove the evil of our existing unhappy divisions. The mere accident that few of the Protestant Churches of the Continent and none of the existing sects of Protestant Nonconformist Churches in England are episcopal seems to have given the question of episcopal or non-episcopal ordination a wholly exaggerated importance in the eyes of the Lambeth fathers. We have hitherto been under the impression that the sin of schism consisted, according to 'Catholic' principles, not in being without bishops, but in refusing to obey bishops and refusing to submit to the one bishop of the diocese and to the organized body over which that bishop presides: and most certainly it is there that the real evil of schism is to be found. The existing division between the Established Church and the United Free Church of Scotland is none the less inconsistent with the true ideal of a united Christian Church, because each of them has the same Presbyterian form of government and each of them accepts the same Westminster Confession. And things would be no better in England if, in place of one episcopal and a dozen unepiscopal Churches, we had thirteen independent episcopal Churches.

But it may be asked, 'would not something be gained if each of these bodies formally, officially and in its corporate capacity at least recognized each of the others as a true branch of the Church of Christ, if each of them sanctioned the participation of its members in the services—including the Eucharists—of every other, if the ministers of each were recognized by each as true Presbyters, fully entitled to preach in the pulpits and to administer the sacraments in every other?' Yes, certainly something would be gained. Mutual recognition would be a good thing, but it might be won at too great a cost.

And I do think that, if the ideal which seems to float before the minds of some at least of the bishops were realized, it would be won at too great a cost. Putting myself into the position of a Nonconformist minister invited to submit to re-ordination at the hands of an Anglican bishop, I should be disposed to say: 'If my re-ordination is necessary to facilitate a real re-union of the Church of Christ in this land, I would accept it without any admission that my previous non-episcopal ordination was a spiritual nullity. Every Church must be governed in some way or other. The episcopal form of government, though it may not belong to the *esse* of the Church, is the form of government—in England at least—of the largest existing communion; it has on its side not indeed the authority of Christ or even of His apostles or the apostolic age, but a long and unbroken tradition dating back to a very early period in the history of the Church, and by many Anglicans it is considered to possess a kind of necessity which few or no members of the non-episcopal Churches attach to the absence of episcopacy. If the untold advantage of re-union could be won by my submitting to receive again a Commission to minister in the re-united Church, which I have already received in my own Church, then it would be worth while for me to make this concession to the possibly unreasonable scruples of my fellow-christians. But if all that I am to gain, or that the Church is to gain, by such a sacrifice is to be occasionally invited to preach in an Anglican pulpit or to officiate at an Anglican altar, while that concession is refused to my unepiscopally ordained brethren, then I do not think the gain is sufficient to justify a step which would seem to involve the admission of that doctrine of episcopacy as a matter of *jus divinum*, which I believe to be unhistorical, unreasonable and unchristian.'

Not only would little be gained by such an acceptance of episcopal ordination without any diminution of the separateness of the existing Churches, but something would be lost by it. If the acceptance were universal, then indeed something might be said for it: but no one with even a little knowledge of human nature can suppose that, on the most favourable estimate, more than a small number of the existing Noncomformist Ministers would be willing, or would be allowed by their

respective communities, to take such a step. And then yo would have immediately a new principle of division introduce The Anglican clergyman would be bound to adopt a totall different attitude towards the episcopally ordained and toward the non-episcopally ordained Nonconformist Minister. The Church of England would be officially pledged to a recognitio of the spiritual necessity of episcopal ordination to which has never yet officially committed itself, and which was hardl ever maintained from the days of Richard Hooker down to th Oxford Movement. And the exclusion from full Christia fellowship of the unepiscopal Ministers and their Churche would only be emphasized. Mutual recognition betwee Church and Nonconformity based on a deep sense of the suprem importance of what all Christian communions have in commo and the unimportance of the forms and ceremonies and th traditional observances in respect of which they differ woul be worth having. Mutual recognition based upon the supposed necessity of episcopal ordination, and the unfathomable gul which divides the episcopally ordained from the unepiscopall ordained minister of the Gospel, would not be a help, but a hindrance to the growth of a spirit of true Christian fellowship among the divided branches of Christ's Church in this or any other country.

Unfortunately the bishops, with all their theoretical recog nition of the 'spiritual reality' (they will not say 'validity') o Nonconformist ministries, have shrunk from the obvious modes of expressing that recognition and of paving the way for further steps towards re-union. They will not expressly sanction interchange of pulpits or inter-communion. It will be pleaded no doubt that to take these steps would produce a violent division in their own ranks—possibly a considerable Anglo-Catholic secession. Very likely they are right; but I am afraid that that only shows that no effective measure of re-union, or even of real and substantial mutual recognition, is possible so long as this state of mind is prevalent. So long as that is the case, further steps towards re-union must be left in the future, as they have in the past, to individual clergymen and sections of the Church who are willing to act without official or corporate sanction. The only one of the resolutions on this head

on which we can look with much satisfaction is an extremely, even ridiculously, qualified permission to individual bishops to go somewhat further than the Conference will recognize as a general rule.[2] The Conference will not sanction a general scheme of interchange of pulpits, but there is no actual condemnation of a bishop who sanctions it in particular cases; and, while the invitation of Nonconformists to a joint communion administered by an Anglican priest is not expressly sanctioned, it is admitted that Nonconformists presenting themselves at the altar are not to be repelled because they have not been confirmed.

Mutual recognition is always possible for individual bishops and Presbyters, or for groups of Churchmen who really care about these things, though the form in which it should be expressed must, of course, be regulated by circumstances. I am not inclined myself to press for sensational demonstrations of recognition which go much beyond what the public opinion of Churchmen in any particular parish or district is prepared for, and which tend to excite displays of bigotry and uncharitableness in our own ranks. Not much can be done when a majority or even a large minority of its clergy are swayed by the *Church Times*. As to measures of further re-union or recognition of a more thoroughgoing and corporate character, I do not think much can be effected till two changes of opinion and temper have taken place. Firstly, there must be a much more general sense of the scandal of disunion, and a much more real desire for re-union, than is at present at all common among either Churchmen or Nonconformists. A very large proportion of Nonconformists are at present disposed to think that the 'Unity of the Spirit'—the mutual recognition and co-operation of the divided bodies—is all that is wanted. And many High Anglicans

[2] The Conference does not condemn the 'occasional authorization [by a Bishop] to ministers, not episcopally ordained, who in his judgement are working towards a scheme of union such as is described in our appeal to preach in churches within his diocese, and to clergy of the diocese to preach in the churches of such ministers.' This falls short of what has been approved by several Bishops, including the Archbishop of York, and is so grudging as to be almost insulting. As to receiving Holy Communion at the hands of Nonconformist ministers the words 'as a general rule' seem to allow of occasional exceptions, *e.g.* (?) when a member of our Church would otherwise be unable to obtain Holy Communion at all.

appear to be in exactly the same state of mind with the pro viso that the recognition and the co-operation should be con fined to ministers who submit to be ordained by bishops whon they have not the slightest intention of obeying.

And secondly there must be a much more general and ex plicit rejection in our own Church of the theory as to the *ju divinum* of episcopacy and the maintenance of the Apostoli Succession, a theory hardly ever maintained by the highes Churchmen before the Oxford movement—or at least a ver considerable modification of that theory, in accordance with th requirements of history, of commonsense, and (let us add) o reverence. The Oxford Movement conception of a God wh makes the giving or the withholding of His 'grace' dependen upon the proper observance of a ceremony hundreds of years ago is rapidly becoming impossible, even in ostensibly High o 'Catholic' circles. Emotionally and religiously, the Lambeth manifesto shows that the bishops are revolting against it; bu intellectually the majority of them have not changed, or are unwilling to admit that they have changed. Or at all events they have allowed themselves to be coerced by threats of secession from a small but very clamorous minority. And yet an intellectual change—in this and other matters—as well as a growth in the moral and religious sense of brotherhood, is necessary before much can be done for the 'Re-union of Christendom.' While we need not discourage such inadequate steps towards recognition as the Lambeth proposals leave open to us, or which may be made by individual bishops and clergy who are prepared to ignore these legally and canonically in operative resolutions, the best way of working for the re-union of Christendom is by promoting the growth of knowledge, of higher conceptions of God, of more reasonable and more spiritual ways of thinking about the Church and the divine government than are officially recognized by the Lambeth pronouncements, whatever may be the private views of individual bishops. Emotionally and religiously those proposals are touched, though hardly dominated, by the best twentieth-century Christian feeling. On the intellectual side they express a mind which has gone back to the seventeenth century, or beyond it.

H. RASHDALL.

THE DOUBT OF ROBERTSON OF BRIGHTON

ROBERTSON'S period of doubt began during his ministry at Cheltenham. Doubt arose quietly and gradually. The influences at work which brought it to a focus are not clear and distinct. We must note all the elements in his life if we desire a complete explanation. This struggle illustrates the greatness of little things.

In analyzing the *conditions* of this struggle, we find there were three factors which contributed to the development and yet the clouding of his mind. First, there were his friends. His friendship with his rector is very significant. His parishioners declared that they could detect a change in his sermons. His intellectual power increased; his generalizations became more daring. But soon there arose a dispute between them, and Robertson became dissatisfied with his rector's teaching and action. The breaking of this friendship was a great shock to Robertson. Another friendship was formed with one well read in metaphysics and acquainted with the theological and philosophical discussions in Germany. Stopford Brooke thinks 'it was partly, at least, due to this friendship that Mr. Robertson escaped from the trammels which had confined his intellect and spirit.' Not that he was a passive instrument upon which friends played, but 'the chords they struck made him conscious of the music in himself; their sympathy drew him out, and sometimes quickened his whole nature into an almost preternatural activity of thought and feeling.'[1]

The second element tending to cause the rise of doubt was the social atmosphere of his parish. It has been called 'a fashionable watering place,' where 'to hold certain doctrines and to speak certain phrases and to feel certain feelings was counted equivalent to a Christian life.'[2] He recoiled from all such unreality; he was disgusted with such superficial religious emotion; he gave up reading devotional books lest he should fall into the same habit. Of the orthodox people and the reli-

[1] *Life and Letters of F. W. Robertson,* Vol. I., pp. 96-99.

[2] A. H. Currier, *Nine Great Preachers,* p. 248.

gious papers of the Evangelical School he said, 'They tell lies in the name of God.' And in a letter he wrote, 'As to the state of the Evangelical clergy, I think it lamentable. I see sentiment instead of principle, a miserable mawkish religion superseding a state which once was healthy. Their adherents I love less than themselves, for they are but copies of their faults in a large edition. I stand nearly alone, a Theological Ishmael. The Tractarians despise me, and the Evangelicals somewhat loudly express their doubts of me.'[3]

The third factor was his reading. He read widely and thoughtfully in Carlyle, Coleridge, Dante, Guizot, Niebuhr, Tennyson and Wordsworth. Carlyle's literary romanticism and Coleridge's philosophical idealism seem to have had a great effect upon him. We shall find that the influence of Wordsworth was of some significance.

Through these and perhaps other factors working together, his doubt gradually but surely increased to such an extent that he could not preach any longer. He gave up his work at Cheltenham, and hastened to the Continent. It was in the famous Tyrol, amidst quiet and rest, that Robertson wrestled in agony and found a peace of mind and spirit.

Just what was his condition during this period of a few months, what was the *character* of his struggle, we do not know. His biographer does not tell us; Robertson himself does not directly reveal it. The stages are veiled in mystery. However, in an address delivered to working men at Brighton, there is a reference to his experience in the Tyrol. We can do no better than to allow him to speak his thoughts in his own words:

> 'It is an awful moment when the soul begins to find that the props on which it has blindly rested so long are, many of them, rotten, and begins to suspect them all; when it begins to feel the nothingness of many of the traditionary opinions which have been received with implicit confidence, and in that horrible insecurity begins also to doubt whether there be anything to believe at all. It is an awful hour—let him who has passed through it say how awful—when this life has lost its meaning, and seems shrivelled into a span; when the grave appears to be the end of all, human goodness nothing but a name, and the sky above this universe a dead expanse, black with the void from which God Himself has disappeared. In that fearful loneliness of spirit, when those who should have been his friends and counsellers only frown upon his misgivings, and profanely bid him stifle doubts, which for aught he knows may arise from the fountain

[3] *Life and Letters, &c.*, Vol. I, p. 101.

> of truth itself; to extinguish, as a glare from hell, that which for aught he knows may be light from heaven, and everything seemed wrapped in hideous uncertainty. I know but one way in which a man may come forth from his agony scatheless; it is by holding fast to those things which are certain still—the grand, simple landmarks of morality.'[4]

Nothing more needs to be added to our study of the condition of his doubt. Here it is in small space, but it touches the heartstrings of humanity. It can be felt better than described.

The *effect* of this struggle can be gained by reading between the lines and by studying carefully what little information we have concerning its character.

The first effect was an inner disorganization of his life. Before the struggle the system on which he founded his faith seemed consistent to him. During the struggle it is broken and shattered. But it must be noted that the change was not with the theological system; the change was in him. In doubt the individual hears two voices: the new and the old. Robertson heard the call of the new while he endeavoured to maintain the old. He could not endure it; his mental self was divided; he plunged into a state of spiritual agony.

A second effect was the inhibition of the greater life forces. It became painful for him to preach. His teaching was altered and very uncertain, as was noticed and commented upon by his congregation. Wherein he had been powerful and attractive and effective, he was now weak, dull, and uninspiring.

The third effect was the agony and pain of mind and spirit. This is very evident in his reference to his condition in the above quotation. There was no peace and rest with such a disorganized soul. Forces were attacking him from every angle, and there was no unity of attitude with which to repel the attack.

Robertson came through the struggle successfully. What were the predominating *causes* or factors in the victory? I do not think it too much to say that Robertson had a feeling that some day he would see the light of a new day. I base this opinion on a conversation which he had with a friend before he left for the Continent. The friend, pointing to the summit of Skiddaw, said: 'I would not have my head like the peak of that mountain, involved, as we see it now, in cloud, for all that

[4] *Ibid*, p. 103.

you could offer me.' 'I would,' replied Robertson, 'for l and by the cloud and mist will roll away, and the sun will com down upon it in all his glory.' This is very significant. kept him, to a certain extent, free from all trace of lower fee ing, pride, vanity and presumption, which are generally th attitudes taken by minds in such conditions. As one writ describes his condition:

> 'There is no trace in him of mere intellectualism, still less sentimentalism, as if it were something fine to be the victim of Divi despair; nor is there, as we may see in George Eliot, any sense superiority over the logic of superstition—only a profound and u utterable misery.'[5]

But we must go deeper in our search for causes. His hop —if there were any, and I believe that for him hope was n absolutely extinguished—was based upon and founded in h *moral hold upon reality*. In continuing the quotation from th lecture to the Brighton working men, we read these profoun words:

> 'In the darkest hour through which a human soul can pass, wha ever else is doubtful, this at least is certain. If there be no Go and no future state, yet, even then, it is better to be generous tha selfish, better to be chaste than licentious, better to be true than fals better to be brave than to be a coward. Blessed beyond all earth blessedness is the man who, in the tempestuous darkness of the sou has dared to hold fast to these venerable landmarks. Thrice blesse is he who, when all is drear and cheerless within and without, whe his teachers terrify him and his friends shrink from him, has ob stinately clung to moral good. Thrice blessed, because his nigh shall pass into clear, bright day.'

A third cause may be found in a fact still deeper: the ver reaction of doubt upon the inner life. It is the function o doubt to compel some sort of faith, generally a new faith. Tha this was the case with Robertson is evident from a significan sentence in one of his letters:

> 'The soul collects its mightiest forces by being thrown in upo itself, and coerced solitude often matures the mental and moral cha acter marvellously.'[6]

He must have been describing his own experience. Tha which seemed to be dividing and destroying his mental an spiritual powers was really enabling them to get a larger an deeper and stronger hold upon Reality.

The sentence just quoted suggests another element in th

[5] J. Tulloch, *Movements of Religious Thought*, p. 303.

[6] Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 304.

cause of his recovery, namely, Nature. In the midst of his agony he did not go to the crowded resort, nor to the city, nor to his friends and relatives. He went to the quiet and solitude of the Tyrol. The part played by Nature dare not be overlooked. Its effect upon the mind in times of distress or struggle is well known. Wordsworth, being one of his favourite poets, no doubt suggested to him in 'The Tables Turned' a way out of the distraction and agony which he was experiencing. He took the poet's advice to:

'Come forth into the light of things,
Let Nature be your teacher.

'One impulse from a vernal wood
May teach you more of man,
Of moral evil and of good,
Than all the sages can.

'Enough of Science and of Art!
Close up those barren leaves;
Come forth, and bring with you a heart
That watches and receives.'

It is instructive to note the *character* of the new faith which resulted. It was firm. To the working men of Brighton he speaks of a faith and hope and trust 'which neither earth nor hell shall shake thenceforth forever.' Throughout all the charges and criticisms of enemies, he never faltered. He knew in Whom he believed, and his faith was strengthened by intellectual conviction. But, further, he possessed a growing, not a static, faith. This is seen by sentences from various letters:

'Clearer, brighter, light every day and more assurance of what truth is and whom I serve.' Again, 'I could not tell you too strongly my own deep and deepening conviction that the truths which I teach are true. Every year they shed fresh light on one another and seem to stretch into immensity . . . I am certain that what fresh light I shall receive will be an expansion and not a contradiction of what I have.'[7]

And just as interesting is the *effect* which the new faith made upon Robertson. First, it brought peace to his soul and unification to his life forces. His whole heart's expression was found in the phrase, 'None but Christ.' By this he meant: nothing but the mind of Christ will bring satisfaction to the soul. He wanted to have that spirit which was in Jesus, to feel as He felt, to think as He thought, to will as He willed. All judgment must be made according to the principles of Christ.

[7] Cf. Currier, *Nine Great Preachers*, p. 256f.

A second effect was to make him more cautious. Naturally sensitive and very responsive, he becomes more self-restrained; he no longer is hurried away by hasty impulse.

> 'Before he gave a public opinion on any subject, he studied it with care. He did not agree blindly on the outside, but sought to attain the central point of a question. But, having come in this way to his opinion, he was bold to avow it. He was loyal to God and his truth, though he might suffer reproach and ostracism because of it.'[8]

Thirdly, there was an unimpeded outlet for the powers of his soul. All were working with unified purpose and aim. Consequently, there was an increase of strength. We are told that he increased in imaginative and dialectic power. People were attracted by his eloquence, and by the clarity and originality of his thought, by his keen logic, and by his profound grasp upon the realities of life.

In the moral life Robertson had a stay and strength which never failed him during the hours of trial. The story of his struggle and victory is the lesson of the power of a pure heart, a good conscience, a noble piety. As the branches of the giant oak are swayed hither and thither by the storms, yet remaining rooted firmly in the earth, so the individual, grounded in piety and morality, will remain stable as a rock while passing through the storms of life. The Christian minister dare not be a party to the lowering of moral standards. There would be more stability in modern life had there been more moral rigour in pulpit and platform teaching. There has been too much of a tendency to compromise on many of the great moral issues, with the inevitable consequence that the youth of to-day are very uncertain in their moral standards. It was no vain exhortation which Paul wrote to the Philippians:

> 'Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things. Those things, which ye have both learned, and received, and heard, and seen in me, do: and the God of peace shall be with you.'

Finally, we learn from Robertson's doubt *the unifying* power of faith. Faith gives unity and organization to one's powers, and therewith comes increased strength.

N. J. Gould Wickey.

Harvard University.

[8] Quoted in *Ibid.*, p. 267.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE IN THEORY AND FACT

'The movement known as Christian Science has undoubtedly helped to call attention to the importance of spiritual forces in the work of healing and in the promotion of happiness and general well being.'

THIS is the testimony of the Lambeth Conference Committee dealing with the Christian Faith in relation to Christian Science. It serves to remind us that our criticism of this religious and therapeutic movement must be constructive. In an article in the *Modern Churchman* on 'Christianity and Psychic Healing' (November, 1919) it is stated:

'Unorthodox societies which are healing men by re-educating their souls, have not had credit for the good they do.'

Many hard things have been said of Christian Science. The *odium theologicum* has been equalled by the *odium medicum*. Dean Lefroy referred to it as 'a compendium of heresy, blasphemy and imposture';[1] Mr. G. K. Chesterton, writing in 1908, expressed himself as follows:

'The cultivated people of our time will generally tend to say of Christian Science that it is a grand and pure philosophy preached, perhaps, by unbalanced or unpleasant people. But I, for one, say it is a mean and disgusting philosophy preached by people who are quite nice. *They* are all right, it is only their creed that comes from hell. The doctrine that pain and death are not real, except in so far as their victims are cowardly enough to submit to them, is a diabolical doctrine. Christianity says that pain is so great a reality that even the Creator could feel it.'

From the medical side we have Dr. Stephen Paget's trenchant and detailed criticism.[2]

There is obviously much scope for destructive criticism in the text-book by which Christian Scientists still profess to stand. There is considerably less, perhaps, in the presentment of this cult by the Christian Science Press at the present day; there we find the crudities and mutual contradictions somewhat refined and rationalized. Nevertheless the fact remains that in spite of all absurdity in *theory*, Christian Science has been

[1] *Christian Science contrasted with Christian Faith and with Itself.* Appendix. S.P.C.K., 1903.

[2] *The Faith and Works of Christian Science.* Macmillan, 1909.

the means of bringing bodily and spiritual health to many whom no other form of religion has touched. Dr. Paget pays his tribute to the fact that there are pleasant people, many of singular refinement, who are the better for Christian Science—happier, healthier, more confident, more active; they have fallen in love again with life. (A result which he assigns largely to the re-discovery of Quietism).

> 'In her company you enjoy a cool sense of detachment, emancipation, wider vision, maturer thought, more spiritual interpretation; a great relief to get away from the common herd that worships a corporeal Jehovah and be in close touch with Being.'[3]

The subject claims our attention. The writer of this article has specially in view the parochial problem. We meet the followers of Mrs. Eddy and we see their works. Members of our congregations are interested in the principles of 'The Church of Christ, Scientist'; many may be strongly attracted by it, some have virtually crossed the Rubicon before they cease attending their parish church. Can it be that Christian Science has something to offer which the Historic Church in this land has not? What is our attitude? The first requisite is certainly an understanding of what Christian Scientists really believe. A sympathetic examination of the Christian Science teaching may be found in two books by Miss Carta Sturge,[4] and in two Essays by the Rev. Harold Anson, entitled 'Prayer as Understanding' and 'Prayer and Bodily Health.'[5] Also in '*Christus Futurus*,' by the author of *Pro Christo et Ecclesia*. The Lambeth Report gives us a concise and balanced summary of the main divergencies of Christian Science from the Catholic Faith. From the academic point of view, 'Eddyism' is interesting. The principle that 'All is Mind,' and Matter a thing of naught, suggests the idealism of Bishop Berkeley, 'run to death.' Belief in absolute truth does not oblige us to discard as unreal all that is *relative*. Moreover the antithesis between Matter and Spirit is unscientific. The interpretation of suffering and the origin of evil are vast

[3] *Op. cit.*, p. 217.

[4] *The Truth and Error of C.S.* John Murray. *Christianity and C.S.* Jack, 1919.

[5] *Concerning Prayer.* Macmillan, 1916.

and mysterious problems[6] which are not solved when Christian Science cuts the Gordian knot by denying the very existence of evil. 'God is of purer eyes than to behold evil.' This phrase was reiterated by a Christian Science healer lately in conversation with the writer, when emphasizing the belief that God did not create evil or disease, and therefore it can have no real existence. Theologically this is a form of ancient Gnosticism. But there is in Christian Science teaching strong faith in the Goodness and Love of God, a conviction of the power of religious thought and meditation, from which our *average* Christianity has much to learn. This, and not its false philosophy, accounts for the widespread influence of Christian Science and its appeal to all sorts and conditions of men, especially when we remember its text-book rests on utterly uncritical and antiquated views of Biblical inspiration. When well-known clergymen become ardent workers in this movement, there must be a strong power *somewhere*, an actuality behind and beneath all the theory. It is well that this should be recognised. We reach the secret of its attractive power when we consider its *therapeutic* aspect. Converts are drawn to it, not by its philosophy or its theology, but *in spite of* them. It is the practical character of its 'works' that more than anything has drawn to this movement supporters from all ranks of life. It has restored apparently dying people to health and activity; it has rescued many from moral ruin; it has substituted hope for despair; courage for fear, and brought deliverance from the oppression of worry and invalidism. There is an enthusiasm and unworldliness to be found usually in Christian Science circles, an atmosphere of fraternity and sympathy, which is often lacking in the wider membership of the Church and the larger Nonconformist bodies. Its successes in the sphere of psychotherapy are undeniable. There are, of course, failures; but Christian Scientists deny that their failures are greater in proportion to those in medical hands. There are also deplorable instances of fanatical refusal to call in medical aid when life could be saved or suffering alleviated by means of *materia medica*. But it is important to realize that physical cures as wonderful as any achieved by Christian

[6] *Cf.* Canon Streeter in Essays *Concerning Prayer.*

Science have been wrought by religious faith and prayer absolutely unconnected with Christian Science theory. The *modus operandi* of the Christian Science healer is more strictly mental than spiritual perhaps. Health, holiness, and happiness, according to their principles, depend upon *right thinking*. Remove error, and harmony both physical and spiritual must result. Let us contrast the cases of spiritual healing (medically diagnosed and attested) wrought within the Church by the Bishop of Assam by means of the prayer of faith, accompanied by the laying on of hands or Unction. Those who are able to hear Dr. Pakenham-Walsh's experiences at first hand while he is in England and study his record of cases, will learn to extend very greatly the limits commonly assigned to the Power of God in working bodily and mental cures in the world to-day. The Church has never officially abandoned belief in spiritual healing. Bishops are still solemnly commissioned to heal the sick, but for many centuries now the statement holds that:

> 'Although in dusty archives, the Church has preserved theoretic belief in her power to heal the sick, she never practically admits that it is her duty to heal them.'[7]

All Christians believe in prayers for the sick, and many doubtless look faithfully for relief from sickness through the power of prayer. But is it not our experience that the prayers and ministrations of a parish priest are seldom requested until the sick person is *in extremis*, the prevalent superstition being that the purpose of the calling of 'the elders of the Church' is *not* the recovery of the patient, but his preparation for death? Not only the Roman Church's use of Extreme Unction, but surely this lack of faith in the power of God to raise up the sick is unscriptural and contrary to the mind of Christ as revealed to us in the Gospels? There are many signs to-day that the English Church is awaking to the importance of the therapeutic aspect of its doctrine and practice. The Lambeth Report breathes the spirit of humility and progressiveness.

> 'We are bound with penitence to acknowledge that there has often been a grave deficiency in our Church's faith and teaching. Not sufficiently have we emphasized our Lord's revelation of the Fatherhood of God, of the fulness of His love, of His loving care of body as well as of soul.'

We are partly indebted to the Christian Science movement for

[7] *Christus Futurus*, p. 249.

the fresh realization of the Power of God and the Will of God in relation to human health and well-being. Possibly the reaction against the blight of Puritan and Calvinistic conceptions in our religious life in England owes somewhat to their indirect influence. That the Christian Science system of thought and practice should be based, as we believe, on a false metaphysic and theology is perhaps not entirely to be wondered at if we go back to the materialistic outlook in America seventy years ago. The practice of mind-cure (by Phineas P. Quimby and subsequently by Mrs. Eddy) must have been much in advance of the theory. And so to-day the New Psychology, which treats of the sub-conscious mind, is still in its infancy. But Christian Science claims to be a therapeutic instrument *quâ Religion*, not merely a science of practical healing. Its aim, apparently, is to restore Primitive Christianity in its purity on a 'scientific' basis, having rid religion of dogmas and scholastic inventions, and to preach the Kingdom of God and to heal the sick as commanded by Jesus. We find ourselves at issue with them not so much in their root ideas (God as Spirit and Life, God's Will for man—health of soul and body) as in their interpretation and application of these ideas. If they cast out devils in Christ's name, let us beware of pouring scorn upon them. We have much to learn and great need to learn it.

> 'A Church which for insanity and hysteria, disease and infirmity can offer none but rare and occasional remedy, which goes further and teaches that these are God's will for the world, is unfit to represent the Apostles or early Fathers, and certainly does not represent the Christ.'[8]

With the practical recommendations of the bishops, with the more modern and scientific teaching as to prayer, with the training of Ordinands in psychology and methods of healing, with the recognition of the ministry and gifts of healing, we may with humility and faith look for more manifest evidence of the working of the Holy Spirit in men's souls and bodies. The Christian Scientist is not afraid to claim the promise of Christ in its literal sense, 'He that believeth in Me, the works that I do shall he do also, and greater works than these.' The power of Christian Science lies partly in the force with which it has re-stated well known truths, and in the fact

[8] *Christus Futurus*, p. 258.

that it has stumbled upon the machinery of mental therapeutics, *i.e.* passivity and suggestion, and co-operation with the Indwelling 'Divine Principle,' the *Vis medicatrix Naturae.* Belief in the non-existence of things physical and material is a form of mysticism which has often sprung up during the course of centuries. To those able to believe it, the announcement that no outward thing is real is a forcible way of bringing home to the mind the supreme reality of spirit. The Church has a more excellent way. St. Paul, lamenting the antagonism between flesh and spirit, gives us his solution: 'The quickening of our bodies by His Spirit which dwelleth in us.' We may apply to the theory and teachings of Christian Science the epigram which Disraeli once used concerning an opponent's speech. In Christian Science we find many true things and many new things; but the new things are not true, and the true things are not new.

J. A. S. GRIFFITHS.

NATURAL LAW AND MIRACLE

By the Rev. J. C. HARDWICK, M.A.

THE word 'law,' in its original sense, means 'a rule laid down for the guidance of an intelligent being by an intelligent being having power over him.'[1] This definition comprises civil and moral law, but excludes scientific or 'natural' law, to which an inaccurate use of language has applied the name. As the same authority observes: 'Besides the various sorts of rules which are included in the literal acceptation of the term law . . . there are numerous applications of the term which rest on a slender analogy, and are merely metaphorical or figurative. Such is the case when we talk of *laws* observed by the lower animals; of *laws* regulating the growth or decay of vegetables; of *laws* determining the movements of inanimate bodies or masses.'[2]

Thus it is evident that the term 'law' is commonly applied to two totally different conceptions; which confusion of lan-

[1] Austin, *Lectures on Jurisprudence,* quoted in Karl Pearson's *Grammar of Science* (Part I), p. 79.
[2] *Ibidem.*

guage has been responsible for a widespread confusion of thought, so that the whole problem of natural or scientific law has been involved in obscurity and misunderstanding. The ideal course would be to agree to confine the term 'law' to legislative enactments, and to select a more accurate term, such as 'formula,' to apply to natural or scientific 'laws.' The usage of the term 'law' in this (illegitimate) sense has, however, been consecrated by tradition, and perhaps we must remain satisfied with an ambiguous term.

But it is important to remember that a scientific 'law' is not a *pre*scription or command, but a mere *de*scription or *résumé* of the observed behaviour of certain objects or classes of objects. And scientific laws are formulated, not by enactment, but by a process of classification and comparison. Men of science observe, compare, and classify phenomena, and sum up or describe their behaviour, and the relations between them, in succinct *formulae*, which, for the sake of convenience, they call 'laws.'

Thus it is an entire delusion to imagine that natural law is something imposed from without upon inanimate (or animate) nature. A natural 'law' is nothing but a formula or *résumé* of the behaviour of certain groups of objects: it is a descriptive generalization, which we make use of in order to enable us to understand them and to deal with them. It tells us that, so far as we can observe, certain classes of objects do, under certain conditions, behave in a certain way.

Thus the notion of 'miracle,' if it be understood to mean 'an interference with the laws of nature,' would appear to the genuine man of science to proceed from a confusion of thought which regards 'laws of nature' in the light of legislative enactments which can, under appropriate conditions, be set aside. The man of science knows of no such laws; he confines himself to *descriptions* of the behaviour of objects. This behaviour does, as a matter of experience, present a large measure of uniformity: but as to the question whether these uniformities *can* ever be disturbed or broken, the scientist would reply that this is a matter for experience to decide. The word 'must' does not exist in the scientists' vocabulary: theoretically, all things are possible, though they are not credited until they are observed.

For instance: if the attention of a physiologist should be drawn to the case of a corpse having 'come to life,' his sole concern would be to ascertain exactly what had happened; *i.e.* whether the death had been a case of 'suspended animation' or not. And if the evidence really should point unavoidably to the conclusion that a body in which all vital functions had definitely ceased, had actually 'come to life' again, he would accept the fact—even though it might compel him to reconstruct all his theories about the nature of life, and the behaviour of organisms generally.

But, though he would accept the phenomenon, he would not call it a 'miracle,' for it would not appear to him in the light of 'an interference with the laws of nature.' He would merely regard this fact as a fresh instance of those peculiar modes of behaviour which characterize organisms. And he would attempt to draw up some new formula to cover the new fact, and to serve as a *résumé* of this and similar experiences.

Of course, the man of science does not rush into a new formula until he has exhausted the possibilities of those which already exist. It is a principle of scientific method to make an exhaustive attempt to fit each new fact as it comes to light into some theory which is already in existence, and not to fly to a new principle of interpretation so long as an old one remains untested. Science is, in other words, conservative in method. Yet it is also progressive in temper: for as soon as ever it becomes evident that the new fact is not covered by the old *formula*, a new one is at once devised to replace it.

We see this happening around us in the scientific world on all hands. Not to speak of psychological and biological formulae, we observe physical formulae which have been for centuries regarded as axiomatic, now recognized to be in need of modification.[3]

But although the genuine scientific attitude is so free from preconceptions, it is natural that men of science should have developed for themselves a more or less characteristic way of looking at things. And it certainly is true that scientific men

[3] The Newtonian physics are to-day disputed. In the case of bodies moving at a velocity equal to that of light, there is involved a diminution of mass. So also (according to Einstein) space becomes 'warped' wherever there is matter.

adopt a fairly definite position with regard to what goes on in the world of nature around them.

They recognize the existence of certain uniformities of behaviour in various spheres. In the first place, objects are observed to move in certain directions and at certain speeds when subjected to certain impulses. Thence it is possible to formulate 'physical laws'—formulae which describe the past behaviour and attempt to predict the future behaviour of material bodies. So also there are formulae to describe the behaviour of certain chemical elements towards one another: these we call 'chemical laws.' So also to describe the behaviour of organisms there are formulated 'biological laws'; and the origin and purpose of 'psychological laws' is similar.

So that science tries to reduce phenomena of every kind to order (so to speak), and presents us with 'a hierarchy of laws'[4] —physical, biological and psychological.

The 'laws' operating on these different levels, however, are not only distinct and heterogeneous, but are at the same time interdependent. That is to say, although living organisms evince characteristic modes of behaviour distinct from the behaviour of inanimate bodies, yet organisms also have points in common with inanimate bodies, and, so far, become 'subject to' the same 'laws.' For example, though my body behaves differently, in many important respects, from an unorganized lump of matter of equal size and weight, yet it is no less subject to the 'law' of gravitation.

So evident, indeed, has this fact always been that it was at one time fashionable to interpret *all* phenomena—even those of life and mind—in purely physical terms; and it is only recently that the enterprise has been abandoned. The position of scientists now seems to be that the inorganic, organic, and psychological areas, in spite of much overlapping, each have their own characteristic modes of behaviour—or characteristic 'laws.' So that the behaviour of organisms is 'inexplicable' if regarded from the point of view of inorganic matter; and the behaviour of 'mind' is 'inexplicable' if regarded from the point of view of organic life, or of matter.

[4] The phrase belongs to Boutroux.

The recognition of these differences, however, does not involve any return of 'interference with natural law.' That expression, and that notion, are obsolete. All that the scientist now ventures to say is that life and mind evince certain characteristic modes of behaviour, which experience does not discover in inanimate objects. If we choose to say that life and mind, and their behaviour, are 'miraculous' from the point of view of 'dead matter,' there is nothing to prevent our doing so; but we must avoid confusing our thought by any conception of 'interference with law.'

The modern view recognizes no 'interference,' for it recognizes no 'laws' (in the old sense). What it does recognize is the co-existence of different types of behaviour—those which respectively characterize inanimate, organic, and 'mind-endowed' things. In some respects behaviour in these three areas coincides: in other respects not. And if we like to call these characteristic modes of behaviour (such as the tendency of a mutilated embryo to 'compensate' itself and develop into a perfect, though smaller, adult) 'interferences' or 'miracles,' regarded from the physical standpoint, we can do so, *so long as we are quite sure that we know what we mean;* and if we do, then we must be careful to make that meaning clear to our hearers, else they may think that we believe that God works by methods which belong to a pre-scientific view of the universe.

IN TROUBLOUS TIMES

By Sir William Ashley, Ph.D., Vice-Principal of the University of Birmingham.*

IN the midst of the perplexities which beset us, I think I cannot do better than try to set before you what seem to me the fundamental thoughts of the New Testament, and then ask whether we can make these throughts our own.

The central idea of the New Testament has its meaning blunted to us by the very familiarity of the language in which it is expressed in the Bible and in the services of the Christian Church. But is it not simply this: that the innermost purpose of the God whom our Lord proclaimed is to overcome evil?

*A Sermon preached in St. Paul's, Birmingham, Dec. 19, 1920.

The Gospels do not attempt to give us an explanation of the origin of evil: philosophers of all ages and theologians of more than one period have attempted to do so; but, if you will reflect, you will remember that the great Creeds of the Church—the Apostles' Creed, which is recited in Morning and Evening Prayer, and the Nicene Creed, recited at the Communion—are entirely reticent on the subject. The Creed at the Communion tells us the meaning of the earthly life of Jesus: it was 'for us men and for our salvation': we know we need salvation from evil in ourselves and around us: we cannot fail to know it, when we have had some experience of life. And in this the Creeds are like the Gospels: they also do not philosophize about the ultimate meaning of evil. They start from the recognition of its actual presence in the world, and assure us that there is a Power whose essential nature is opposed to it, a Power with whom we men and women are called upon to co-operate, a Power which will ultimately triumph. The teaching of the New Testament is not that of certain Oriental religions which has sometimes crept into Christianity; that evil is to be escaped by leaving it alone, to continue to do its work, while the soul escapes to some blessed sphere of untainted calm, whether in this life or in some other. Still less is it that moral judgments, the difference between right and wrong, helpful and harmful, are without any ultimate justification in the nature of the universe. No; the New Testament view is that evil is an actual fact which we are called upon, by our very manhood and womanhood, to battle against. And from this arises the fundamental Christian conception of God. Do you remember how in the Litany we turn to God and look to Him to 'deliver us' from 'the evils which the craft and subtlety of devil or man worketh against us,' and we express the expectation that He will indeed do this 'for' His 'honour'? That is an arresting phrase: the *honour* of the God we believe in is involved in the struggle; He is like a commander who cannot, for honour's sake, abandon his men, a captain who cannot leave the bridge. But the writer who is known as St. John had a deeper thought still: not the honour only, the very being of God is involved. That is what is meant by the wonderful saying, 'God is Love': not that there is simply a God who, among other qualities, is

loving, as a friend might be loving; His love, *i.e.* His active goodwill toward us, being, as it were, a separable attribute. When we say 'God is Love,' we should mean infinitely more than this. We should mean that, in spite of all appearances to the contrary, the key to all this perplexing scene,

> 'The burden and the mystery
> Of all this unintelligible world,'

as Wordsworth puts it, is a beneficent purpose, and a purpose which the human reason can recognize as, in some comprehensible sense, a moral one. And in the sorest times the Christian Church has never abandoned the conviction that this purpose will finally be accomplished. In various imagery it has looked forward to what Tennyson has written of as

> 'one, far-off, divine, Event
> To which the whole creation moves';

when 'God shall be all in all,' and 'the kingdoms of this world' shall have become 'the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ.'

The saying, 'God is Love,' comes from the writing which we know as the First Epistle of St. John. This was one of the last books to be written among those which were afterwards collected to form the New Testament: it shows us how the Christian message presented itself when the permanent meaning of our Lord's teaching had been disentangled from the temporary associations of the first group of His followers. Listen again, then, to the way in which this writer interprets the mission of our Lord:

> 'For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil.'

The sense of the passage may perhaps come to us more freshly in a modern translation:

> 'This is why the Son of God appeared, to destroy the deeds of the devil.'

We call our Lord, and with reason, 'the Son of God': but the same writer reminds us that we also in our measure are 'sons of God'; and, as he views it, the purpose of our Lord's life on earth is the purpose of our life on earth too; for, 'as He is, so are we, in this world.'

That the forces of evil are personified in this and some other passages in the New Testament need not distract our attention from the root idea. It doesn't in the least matter if

this personification entered into the Hebrew religion during the Captivity, and so later into Christianity, from the sacred writings of Persia. We may regard it as Persia's part in the providential education of the human race, to first realize, vividly and persistently, the contest between Good and Evil as the ground plot of the world's drama. But the New Testament writers are concerned infinitely more with visible wickedness than with mythological fancies about it; the language they use is evidently poetical and figurative; used simply as the current form of speech to designate facts which all could see. And so to-day, we need have no theory of the origin of evil; we know only too well what we mean when we call an action 'devilish.'

The fact is, however, that the only attempt by a New Testament writer to work out a conscious theory of moral evil is in harmony with the most modern science. It is Paul's doctrine of 'the law in our members warring against the law in our mind.' This doctrine is the 'intuition,' we may say, using secular language, of a 'great religious genius,' who had found it hard himself to arrive at inner tranquility. But the same thought has been pressed upon us, and made indeed painfully real, by modern Darwinism. If mankind, as we have reason to believe, has slowly emerged from millions of years of existence on lower planes of purely animal life, how vast a range of human failure and suffering finds in such a fact a ready explanation! If our task—to quote Tennyson again—is to

> 'work out the Beast,
> And let the Ape and Tiger die'

within us, until man is finally master of himself and his will freed from its animal inheritance, how astoundingly appropriate is the apostle's prophetic vision of the time when 'we shall all come unto a perfect man!' that is—for this is the sense of the phrase—the time when humanity will reach maturity. And where, with the Gospels before us, can we find a higher example of what mankind is capable than what the same Paul goes on to call 'the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ'—in modern translation, 'the full measure of development which belongs to Christ?'

Amid all that is doubtful, this much is recognised by modern scholars: that in the life and teaching of Jesus a new note sounded in the world, the note of 'redeeming activity'—of active, compassionate, sympathetic endeavour to lift the burdens from men's lives and consciences. And in that sense—in the sense of what Jesus was and what He stands for—can we desire anything better than that—as we are singing this evening—

> Jesus shall reign where'er the sun
> Doth his successive journeys run?

Dr. Watts was sometimes a true poet. 'O God, our help in ages past,' has, during the trials of the last six years, become our national anthem, when we are trying to be our best selves. And also this hymn appeals to most of us by its universality. For we are all 'the sons of want'—want spiritual, intellectual, material; and we most of us know in our hearts that in sober truth,

> 'Blessings about where'er He reigns.'

But now let us remind ourselves of this accompanying and persistent idea in the New Testament—that the following of Christ in the fight against evil, in ourselves and in our environment, cannot but be accompanied by suffering. It is the paradox of the Christian life, that its two notes are Joy and Suffering; that the Christian can at the same time address Duty, as Wordsworth does, as 'stern lawgiver,' and yet say:

> 'Nor know we anything so fair,
> As is the smile upon thy face.'

It was the same Jesus who said: 'Come unto Me, and I will give you rest,' who also said, 'Whosoever will come after Me, let him take up his cross.' And the same Paul who delights in telling of the fruits of the Spirit, 'love, joy, peace,' also reminds us that we can only fully realize our brotherhood with Christ 'if so be that we suffer with Him.'

But notice this: the idea that the accomplishment of the Divine plan involves suffering, and even apparent defeat sometimes, is an idea which mankind has always found it very hard to rise to. You remember how, when our Lord confided to His disciples His expectation that, if He went up to deliver His message in Jerusalem, 'He 'must suffer many things,' Peter

remonstrated with Him for anticipating trouble. In such a frame of mind, which refuses to face realities, our Lord perceived a main cause of failure. 'Get thee behind me, Satan!' He ejaculated. Are not most of us still Peters? We imagine we have a right, either to 'a good time,' or, if trouble comes, to some quick dramatic intervention. Not content to give our best judgment to discern our duty, and then our best strength to do it, and have faith that, somehow, 'all things will work together for good,' we 'seek for a sign from heaven.' Yet we are told that such a demand caused our Master to 'sigh deeply in His spirit,' and solemnly assure His hearers 'there shall no sign be given to this generation.'

'The Jews require a sign,' says Paul—and is not that what many irreligious and some religious people still look for? Although our Lord expressly told us that God 'maketh His sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust,' our thoughts are still so pagan that we would fain demand that the order of physical nature should be set on one side for our benefit. 'And the Greeks seek after wisdom,' Paul goes on: the intellect craves for some philosophy which shall somehow explain evil, or explain it away. But it was Paul's conviction, and it will surely help us if we can make it our own, that the world's deliverance can only be attained through pain of body and agony of spirit, and what at the moment may seem irremediable disaster. 'We proclaim,' he says, 'a Christ who has been crucified.'

It is possible, some of you may say: 'No doubt this is all in the New Testament, but can it be proved to be true?' No, it cannot be conclusively proved to be the only right view of the Universe, in the sense that a mathematical proposition can be proved. No accumulation of merely intellectual arguments can prove the existence of a good God, beyond the possibility of doubt. Christianity is essentially an attitude and a temper: an attitude of confidence that somehow the Universe has a good meaning, a temper of determination to help our fellow-men. Such an attitude is not inconsistent with the large lessons of human evolution, as taught us by modern science; and it is conducive to progress, as our reason conceives of it. But let us be frank: to adopt such an attitude requires a venture of

faith. It is as true now as when Paul wrote to the Romans that 'we are saved'—our inner selves are placed in salutary relations to the Universe—'by hope,' 'and hope that is seen is not hope.' And yet there is this confirmation by experience. Such an attitude and such a temper do bring men inward satisfaction. Men and women in all ages, who have 'come to Jesus,' in this sense of 'learning of Him' to share in His outlook and in His endeavour, have found 'rest unto their souls.' We dare not claim to be 'righteous,' and we know we are not as 'true-hearted' as we might be; but yet, in the degree in which men and women have tried to be these things, the verse we have sung to-night from the Psalmist is continually verified:

> There *is* sprung up a light for the righteous:
> And joyful gladness for such as are true-hearted.

A NEW PHILOSOPHY[1]

It seems evident that philosophy has not yet entered that *cul-de-sac* which some people have been anticipating. Indeed, metaphysics, if movement be a sign of life, displays a remarkable vitality.

The nineteenth century, a period which is not only socially, politically, and ethically, but philosophically, remote, was chiefly notable for the emphasis it laid upon the 'oneness' of existence. Even hostile schools had this in common; in this respect, T. H. Green and Herbert Spencer were far nearer to one another than either suspected. The object of philosophic search in every school was the same, though it was sought (and found) in different places. The Idealists found the unity of existence in the Absolute, the Evolutionists found it in Law, the Materialists in Matter.

The tendency nowadays seems to be towards some less ambitious scheme, and philosophers are content to emphasise the diversity, rather than the unity, of existence. A philosophy of 'discontinuity' (as it is called) is, in one or other of its forms, coming into evidence on all hands.

By a philosophy of 'discontinuity' is meant a view of existence that takes note of those differences in *quality* which seem to characterise phenomena on their various levels (as we may call them). Instead (for instance) of forcing the phenomena which are characteristic of organic life to fit themselves into chemical and physical categories, the tendency nowadays (both among philosophers and biologists) is to regard 'life' as a kind of new reality—an entirely new quality of existence.

The recently published *Gifford Lectures* of Professor Alexander are characteristic of the new attitude. Dr. Alexander, like Mr. Bertrand Russell at Cambridge, and Professor Barton Perry at Harvard, is an exponent of the 'New Realism,' which is a revival of what has been un-

[1] *Space, Time, and Deity. Gifford Lectures* for 1916–18. S. Alexander, M.A., LL.D., F.B.A 2 vols. 36/- net. Macmillan.

sympathetically described as the 'antiquated metaphysics which talk about existence *per se*, out of all relation to minds.'

The 'new' realists differ from the 'old' in being upholders of 'discontinuity.' Unlike their predecessors, they regard 'mind' as real and self-existent, even though it may not be independent of physical processes. They do not attempt to express everything in terms of matter and motion. Nor yet, on the other hand, do they (like the idealists) attempt to express everything in terms of mind.

For Professor Alexander, mind is a new *quality* of existence emergent from life, just as life, in its turn, is a new *quality* of existence emergent from matter. It is, indeed, possible to express mind in terms of life (or of matter) without remainder, or to express life in terms of matter (*i.e.* in chemical and physical terms); but such expressions will miss the characteristic quality of existence which makes these spheres unique and (so to speak) autonomous.

Reality may indeed be described as developing itself in an ascending series, and there emerges at each successive stage something entirely new. To quote a characteristic passage, which deals with the problem of the emergence of 'mind' from a physiological background:

> 'Mental process is something new, a fresh creation, which, despite the possibility of resolving it into physiological terms, means the presence of so specific a physiological constitution as to separate it from simpler vital processes . . . Abt Vogler in Browning's poem declares of the musician "that out of three sounds he frames not a fourth sound, but a star." Out of certain physiological conditions nature has framed a new quality—mind—which is therefore not itself physiological, though it lives and moves and has its being in physiological conditions . . . Mind is thus at once new and old. No physiological constellation explains for us why it should be mind. But at the same time, being thus new, mind is . . . not something distinct and broken off from [the neutral processes], but has its roots or foundations in all the rest of the nervous system. It is in this sense that mind, and mental process are vital, but not merely vital.'—(Vol. II, pp. 7-8).

The basic 'stuff' out of which the successive stages of existence are built up, is an entity which Professor Alexander terms 'space-time'; and it may be urged that this theory of a common constituent of all being is equivalent to the old 'monisms' of the nineteenth century. But the new philosophy places the emphasis, not on the 'raw material' in terms of which everything can, in the last resort, be expressed, but on the new qualities of existence which successively emerge therefrom.[2]

The most interesting part of Professor Alexander's system is, from our point of view, his conception of 'deity.' 'Deity' from the human standpoint is the quality which will develop out of mind, just as mind has developed out of life. 'Deity' is, indeed, the next emergent quality to that which has already emerged. From the point of view of matter, life is 'deity.' From that of life, mind; and so on. But when 'deity' has once developed it is no longer (from its own point of view) deity at all; it looks forward in its turn to the next successive emergent quality, which will be 'deity' for it. 'Deity' in fact is always something that is coming

[2] Students of philosophy will note a certain parallelism between these notions and the attitude of Lotze when he laid it down as the business of his philosophy to show 'how *absolutely universal* is the extent and at the same time how *completely subordinate the significance, of the mission which mechanism has to fulfil in the structure of the world.*' (Introduction to the *Microcosmus*; the italics are his).

to the birth, but is not yet born: something which 'the whole creation groaneth and travailleth' to produce.

'Deity,' thus, is not mind or 'spirit,' it is something as different from mind, as mind is from organic life, or an organism from a lump of 'dead matter.' As mind may be described as the 'soul' of life (or life the 'soul' of matter), so deity, in its turn, would be (when developed out of mind) the 'soul' of mind, and something quite different *in quality* from mind.

Thus the term 'god' might be applied to any being in whom the quality of 'deity' was developed. Though, of course, from his own point of view, such a being would not be god, but would look ahead to the emergence of the next quality in the series which, for him, would be 'deity.'

Yet the term 'god' may be applied not only to a finite being in whom 'deity' has developed, but also to the whole of existence as tending towards deity; to 'the nisus in the world which drives it to the generation of fresh empirical qualities,' which nisus is, not a speculation, but 'a verifiable fact.'

If asked for the grounds upon which he bases his belief that mind is moving towards the generation of a fresh empirical quality—deity, Professor Alexander would not rest his argument only upon the analogy of previous developments, but would point to the religious emotion, which he characterises as a feeling for the world as a whole in its forward tendency:

> 'The body of the universe affects our body, and the ultimate response in consciousness is this religious emotion. Like hungry appetite it is a conation whose object, God, is to it as food is to hunger. The religious conation which sets us in search of God is 'our groping out to the reality, which is God.'[3]

The specifically religious feeling is not to be confused with the more specifically cognitive faculties, whose function is secondary not primary, explaining, merely, not discovering:

> 'For the world is not merely what it is for the intellect alone. [How could it be, when 'mind' is only one quality in a series?] Its *nisus* towards what is higher . . . affects the mind by other ways than cognition. The whole world with its real tendency to deity stirs in us from the depths of our nature a vague endeavour or desire which shadows forth its object. Then intellect comes into play and discovers in detail the characters of this object, and finds at last what it truly is, the tendency forwards towards a new quality.'[4]

To apply these new conceptions of deity, if they can be applied, to the Christian scheme of theology is not our present purpose. It is not necessary to imagine that an immediate reconstruction of theology is demanded by every advance (or decline) in metaphysics; but, at the same time, it is well that theologians should study the bearing of each development as it arises, upon the traditional position.

As for the philosophers, it is not to be expected, or desired, that they should embrace new conceptions without examining them. Yet perhaps Professor Alexander will be fortunate if he escapes some measure of misunderstanding even in this quarter. It is quite likely that a cool reception may be extended to a view of things which lays so much emphasis upon what is empirical and (one might almost say) tangible.

[3] Vol. II, p. 376 [4] Vol. II, p. 377.

Still, Professor William James was perhaps right in saying that the old idealist philosophy would be short-circuited, and its results established by newer methods.

J. C. HARDWICK.

CORRESPONDENCE

BERGSON'S VIEW OF GOD.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE *Modern Churchman.*

SIR,

I have just read Canon Glazebrook's excellent article, 'Changeless Faith and Changing Thought,' in the December number of the *Modern Churchman.* There is one sentence in it which, in justice to Professor Bergson, I feel sure Canon Glazebrook will be pleased that I should venture to challenge. On page 466 he uses these words: '*The dualistic doctrines of Bergson and the Pragmatists invite us to believe that a Godless universe is growing and advancing it knows not how or whither.*'

I am not concerned for the moment with the doctrines of the Pragmatists, but with regard to Bergson it must be emphatically said that he does not ask us to believe in a Godless universe. On the contrary he expressly repudiates this doctrine. Canon Glazebrook charges Bergson with Godless 'dualism,' others have charged him with a kind of 'atheistic monism.' Let us listen to his own words as to these charges. 'The considerations set forth in my Essay on the "*Immediate Data of Consciousness*" result in bringing the fact of liberty to light: I hope the considerations in "*Matter and Memory*" enable us to put our finger on the reality of mind: "*Creative Evolution*" presents creation as a fact. From all this arises a clear conception of a free and creating God, the Author at once of matter and of life; and as far as relates to life His creative effort continues at work through the evolution of species and the creation of human personalities' (see the volume on Bergson, by Edouard Le Roy, entitled '*Une Philosophie Nouvelle*,' page 202).

What Bergson does reject and what Professor Le Roy considers he is right in rejecting are doctrines which confine themselves to personifying the unity of nature or the unity of knowledge in a God who is nothing but an immobile principle, who would in reality be nothing since He does nothing. I would venture to recommend Professor Le Roy's book to members of the Union who would like to have a clear and accurate outline of Bergson's philosophy. I think it is to be had in an English translation published by Williams and Norgate. Professor Le Roy is, as many of your readers are aware, one of the brilliant band of French Modernists whose writings incurred so much hostility in the days of the late Pope. As a layman Le Roy, unlike Loisy, was not, I believe, excommunicated.

W. D. MORRISON.

ST. MARYLEBONE RECTORY, LONDON.

THE SOUTH AFRICAN CHURCH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE *Modern Churchman.*

SIR,

As a South African reader of the *Modern Churchman,* and by no means the only one, may I send a word of protest against the disparaging reference to the South African Church contained in your May number. The writer of the article 'Erastianism Examined' describes that Church as one where 'the ecclesiastical watch-dogs are so vigilant, and the ecclesiastical discipline so rigorous, as to suggest that if a second Colenso were to arise within its borders the treatment of the first would be

repeated. My impression after several years work in a South African diocese is one of greater freedom in almost every respect than at home. The late Archdeacon Wirgman, whose authority is adduced for the statement quoted, may have been speaking correctly for his own particular corner of the Province, though I am inclined to doubt it, but to imply that South Africa generally is the home of ultra-ecclesiasticism or intellectual obscurantism, is to give an impression which anyone familiar with the church life of that country will recognise as false.

SOUTH AFRICAN INCUMBENT.

THE RIGHT OF MODERN CHURCHMEN TO EXIST.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE *Modern Churchman.*

SIR,

In your notes in the 'Signs of the Times' of the November issue of the *Modern Churchman* you call attention to the Bishop of Chelmsford's address at the opening of the Southend Church Congress, in which he made a powerful appeal for more cordial relations between the Anglo-Catholics and the Evangelicals, and declared that the only wise and hopeful policy of the Church was one of 'whole-hearted inclusion' between these two parties. And you quote with approval from a leading article in the *Church Times,* which puts the pertinent question as to whether the Bishop, by making no mention of that third party in the Church, the Liberal or Broad Church party, wished it to be understood that what he advocated was 'an offensive and defensive alliance' between Anglo-Catholics and Evangelicals against Liberalism. That a comment of this kind should come from the *Church Times* is a proof, if such were needed, that there can be no proper understanding or appreciation of the genius of the Anglican Church, which deliberately excludes Liberals or Modernists as a recognised party within it. The Dean or St. Paul's has lately given it as his opinion that the Anglo-Catholic party has probably reached its zenith, and is now on the decline; while there are many indications that there never was a time when Broad Churchmen, who have reached in the Churchmen's Union the status of a party, had a greater influence in the counsels of the Church, and were more looked to for guidance in the difficult problems that must inevitably arise in the adjustment of the traditional definitions and expositions of the Christian Faith to the ever growing body of ascertained truth.

Whatever our sympathies may be, whether they be High Church or Low Church, it is impossible to ignore the Broad Church party. And in proof of this, it is interesting to be reminded, that when the Public Worship Regulation Bill of 1874 was before the House of Lords, Lord Salisbury dwelt strongly, in a speech advocating it, on the danger of imperilling the spirit of toleration which was a mark of the Anglican Church, and while admitting that a check on lawlessness was desirable, deplored any attempt to crush out a recognized party within it. And he went on to insist that the three great schools in the Church, the Sacramental, the Emotional, and the Philosophical (Disraeli in the Commons defined these three parties, which he considered were perfectly legitimate, as characterized respectively by ceremony, enthusiasm, and free speculation), must be frankly accepted; and that no attempt must be made to drive any of them into secession. (See *Life of Disraeli,* Vol. V, pp. 321, 325.)

It is significant that so pronounced a High Churchman as Lord Salisbury should recognize that Broad Churchmen had as good a right to exist as Anglo-Catholics, with whom his real sympathies lay.

F. G. GIVEN-WILSON.

THE VICARAGE, DEDHAM, ESSEX.

The Sheldonian Shorthand and Typewriting Offices, 45 Broad Street, Oxford.

(Behind the Post Office. No front shop). Tel. 500.

CONDUCTED BY A PRACTISED WRITER:

Prize Essayist and Magazine Editor.

Prospectus on Application.

J. WIPPELL & Co., Ltd.

ECCLESIASTICAL ART WORKERS.	MAKERS OF CLERICAL OUTFIT.
EMBROIDERY, WOOD. STONE. METAL, AND STAINED GLASS.	CLOTHING. HATS. CASSOCKS, SURPLICES, ROBES, HOODS, STOLES, VESTMENTS, ETC.

EXETER 55 & 56, HIGH STREET, AND CATHEDRAL YARD; & 4 & 5, DUNCANNON ST., CHARING CROSS, **LONDON.**

CASTELL & SON.

(ESTABLISHED 1846).

Tailors, Robe Makers, and Clerical Outfitters,

13 BROAD STREET, OXFORD.

Representatives travel regularly and appointments are respectfully solicited.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN'S LIBRARY.

Edited by the Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.

3*s.* 6*d.* net each volume. In Paper Covers, 2*s.* net each.

I. The Faith of a Modern Churchman. By the Rev. Canon M. G. GLAZEBROOK, D.D., Canon of Ely. *Second Edition.*

'His simple statement of Christian doctrine is characterised by courage, wide learning, a broad point of view, and a very real reverence.'—*The Scotsman.*

II. The Genius of the English Church. By the Rev. ALFRED FAWKES, M.A., Vicar of Ashby St. Ledgers.

'We hope it may secure a very wide circle of readers.'—*The Spectator.*

III. The Evolution of the Christian Ministry. By the Rev. J. R. COHU, M.A. (sometime Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford).

'We do not know anyone who could have written it better.'—*Expository Times.*

IV. Baptism, Confirmation and the Eucharist. By the Rev. JOHN GAMBLE, B.D., Vicar of St. Mary's, Leigh Woods.

'His clear and reverent treatment of a difficult subject . . . will commend the book to Churchmen of all schools.'—*Nation.*

JOHN MURRAY, Albemarle Street, LONDON, W.1.

RIPON HALL, OXFORD.

(Founded by the Right Rev. W. BOYD CARPENTER, D.D., D.C.L., at Ripon in 1898, moved to Oxford in 1919).

Warden—The Right Rev. H. M. BURGE, D.D., Lord Bishop of Oxford.

Principal—Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.

Vice-Principal—Rev. C. W. EMMET, B.D., Fellow of University College, Oxford.

This Theological College is centrally situated and provides, in conjunction with the Oxford University Ordination Course with which it co-operates, an adequate modern training for Candidates for Holy Orders in any diocese.

The academic year consists of three terms of about nine weeks each. In 1921 there will be a fourth (but non-compulsory) term in the Long Vacation.

The inclusive terminal fee is £30.

Graduates are eligible for admission and also Non-Graduate Service Candidates.

Applications for admission should be addressed to THE PRINCIPAL.

PRINTED AT THE HOLYWELL PRESS, OXFORD.